

# Movement of Open Country Population in Ohio

P. G. Beck and C. E. Lively



OHIO  
AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION  
Wooster, Ohio



This page intentionally blank.

## CONTENTS

Introduction .....	3
Method and Source of the Data .....	3
Characteristics of the Population from Which the Migrants Came.....	4
Composition and Characteristics of the Migrant Population .....	5
Age and Sex .....	5
Schooling .....	6
Marital Status .....	8
Occupation .....	8
Location .....	10
Type of Community .....	10
Distance from Parental Home .....	11
The Relation of Mobility to Selected Factors .....	12
Occupational Mobility .....	12
Occupation of Parents .....	12
Size of Parental Farm Business .....	14
Movement History of Parental Family .....	16
Occupational History of Parental Family .....	17
Supplementary Occupation of Parental Family .....	19
Inheritance of Farm by Parental Family .....	19
Schooling of Parents .....	20
Organization Affiliation of Parental Family .....	21
Number of Children in Parental Family .....	22
Order of Birth .....	23
Age of the Migrants .....	25
Age at Starting for Self .....	27
Initial Occupation .....	29
Parental Home of Wife or Husband .....	31
Schooling .....	32
Spatial Mobility .....	35
Type of Community .....	36
Occupation .....	36
Section of the State .....	37
Initial Location .....	38
Date of Migration .....	39
Schooling .....	40
Distance from Parental Home .....	41
Residence in Open Country, Village, or City .....	42
Occupation .....	43
Summary and Conclusions .....	44
Bibliography .....	46

This page intentionally blank.

# MOVEMENT OF OPEN COUNTRY POPULATION IN OHIO

## II. The Individual Aspect

P. G. BECK AND C. E. LIVELY

### INTRODUCTION

This bulletin is concerned with the territorial movements and occupational changes of 1589 boys and girls who were reared in the open country of Ohio. A previous bulletin (2) dealt with the movements of 1275 open country families that, during the period 1927-1928, were living in eight selected areas of Ohio. This bulletin deals only with the children of these families; i. e., with those children who, at the time of the survey, had attained sufficient maturity to begin life for themselves by becoming economically independent of the parental family.

Much has been written concerning the movement of farm boys and girls away from agriculture to other occupations, and there is a lively public interest in the subject. Many theories have been advanced regarding the selective nature of this migration and its probable effect upon the quality of the farm population. In view of the large number of migrants who have left the farms during the last decade, further scientific study of the extent and nature of the movement is timely. It is particularly important that scientific investigation shall aid in answering such questions as, Who are the farmers of tomorrow? From what families do they come? What is their equipment for farming, and what are their chances for success? This bulletin attempts to answer these and other related questions.

**Method and source of the data.**—The data of this study were obtained by personal visits<sup>1</sup> to 1275 open country households, located in 8 townships in various parts of the State. In each township all of the families living in a contiguous area were visited, in most cases all of the families in the township. Each township selected for study was chosen as an example of a certain type condition prevalent in the State. The State was arbitrarily divided into three sections on the basis of urbanization, topography, soil type, and type of agriculture, for purposes of sampling. The dominant characteristics of the sections were as follows: (a) Northeastern

---

<sup>1</sup>The field work was done during 1927-1928, by P. G. Beck with the assistance, in the Northeastern Section, of L. A. Cramer, a graduate assistant in the department.

Section,—urbanized, industrialized area with a relatively infertile soil; (b) Western Section,—the western half of the State, containing most of the fertile agricultural land, has a number of widely scattered large cities; (c) Southeastern Section,—the unglaciated portion of the State, topography rolling to very hilly, known as the “hill section,” chiefly rural.<sup>2</sup>

Each family visited was asked to give the mobility history of all children born into it, from the time they “started for themselves” to the date of the investigation. Thus, the information presented here was gathered chiefly from the parents of the individuals under study. In cases where adult children were living in the same township as their parents, the data were available from two sources (parents and children), and one was checked against the other. From the 1275 families (households) visited, record was made of 1596 children that had “started for themselves”. Usable records were obtained for 1589 of these. “Started for themselves” is taken here to mean independence from the parental family for support and includes some individuals yet living with their parents who were earning their own living. In the case of the females, marriage was accepted as *prima facie* evidence that they had “started for themselves”. Children in college were not included among those who had “started for themselves” unless they were entirely self-supporting. From this point on the term “migrant” is applied to all individuals who had “started for themselves,” in order to simplify the wording of the text.

**Characteristics of the population from which the migrants came.**—Ohio's open country population has been recruited from various sources. It is dominated by descendants of emigrants from the New England and Middle Atlantic States, with German immigrants a close second. The Germans came in chiefly after 1830, and, as a result, more of them are to be found in the Western Section, parts of which represent the most recently settled portions of the State. Negroes make up a small part of the population in a few counties of the Western and Southeastern sections. Aside from the influx of foreign-born immigrants in the Northeastern Section during the past 15 or 20 years, there has been little change in the racial composition since 1870. Although there has been considerable immigration from Kentucky and West Virginia into the Southeastern Section, this has changed the racial composition but little, since these are of essentially the same stock as the people already in this Section.

---

<sup>2</sup>For more details of the method of sampling and for location and description of the sections studied see Ohio Agr. Exp. Sta. Bulletin No. 467, **The Movement of Open Country Population in Ohio: I. Family Aspect.**

The families from which the migrants came were fairly representative of the total group included in this study except for certain variations herein noted. In the first place, the older families had the most migrants. Such a correlation between age of parental family and number of migrants is, of course, to be expected. In the second place, due to the somewhat greater age of the non-farm families and to the fact that migrants from non-farm families started for themselves at an earlier average age than those from farm families, a proportionately greater percentage of the migrants came from the non-farm than from the farm group. Note the tabulation below. The farm families made up 93 per cent of the total families of the sections studied but furnished only 91 per cent of the migrants; the non-farm families made up 7 per cent but furnished 9 per cent of the migrants.

	Per cent		
	Farmer <sup>3</sup>	Non-farmer	Total
Total families.....	93	7	100
Migrants—total.....	91	9	100
Male.....	90	10	100
Female.....	91	9	100

The number of moves and range of movement (See Bulletin 467) of the parental family were apparently in no way related to the number of migrants furnished. Although there was some variation with reference to these indices of movement, this variation was obviously due to differences in age of family.

## COMPOSITION AND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE MIGRANT POPULATION

### AGE AND SEX

In a sample such as was taken for this study the age composition of the migrants is largely determined by the age of the families from which they came. The Western Section of the State had the youngest families, and, likewise, the average age of the migrants was younger there. The well established fact that females migrate at an earlier age than males is illustrated by the figures in Table 1. The average age of the female migrants was lower in every section than that of the males.

<sup>3</sup>“Farmer,” as used in this bulletin, includes all persons engaged actively in agriculture; i. e., owners, renters, and farm laborers, and retired farmers. All others are classed as non-farmer. This differs from the definition used in the previous report of this study (Bulletin 467); in the latter, “Farm laborers” were not classified as “Farmers.”

TABLE 1.—Age and Sex Distribution of the Migrants

Age in years	Total		Western Section		Northeastern Section		Southeastern Section	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
<i>Number</i>								
Under 20 .....	44	53	10	20	19	20	15	13
20-24 .....	176	177	70	65	61	67	45	45
25-29 .....	170	180	70	78	60	63	40	39
30-34 .....	142	149	64	61	47	53	31	35
35-39 .....	106	116	40	46	32	44	34	26
40-44 .....	72	67	28	30	27	22	17	15
45-49 .....	49	35	20	11	15	16	14	8
50- .....	31	14	7	4	14	7	10	3
Age unknown .....	4	4	4	0	0	4	0	0
Total .....	794	795	313	315	275	296	206	184
<i>Per cent</i>								
Under 20 .....	5.6	6.7	3.2	6.4	6.9	6.8	7.3	7.2
20-24 .....	22.3	22.4	22.7	20.9	22.2	23.0	21.9	24.4
25-29 .....	21.5	22.8	22.7	25.0	21.8	21.6	19.4	21.2
30-34 .....	18.0	18.8	20.7	19.6	17.1	18.1	15.0	19.0
35-39 .....	13.4	14.7	12.9	14.8	11.6	15.1	16.5	14.1
40-44 .....	9.1	9.5	9.1	9.6	9.8	7.5	8.3	8.1
45-49 .....	6.2	4.4	6.5	3.5	5.5	5.5	6.8	4.3
50- .....	3.9	1.7	2.2	1.2	5.1	2.4	4.8	1.7
Total .....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Masculinity (males per 100 females)								
1. Migrants .....	100		99		93		112	
2. Population of the section .....	108		109		105		114	

While the masculinity (males per 100 females) of the population of the sections at the time this study was made was 108, that of the migrants was but 100. The earlier age of migration of the females resulted in the inclusion of a greater proportion of the female than the male children among the migrants and thus lowered the masculinity of the migrant group. This was especially true in the Northeastern Section where there were numerous opportunities for the young female who sought employment. Only in the rural and agriculturally backward Southeastern Section was the masculinity of the migrants over 100.

#### SCHOOLING

Migrants of the Northeastern Section had the highest average schooling. This same Section also had the highest percentage of migrants who had less than eight grades of schooling. The Western Section was second in the matter of level of schooling, and the Southeastern Section lowest. The latter Section had almost twice



as large a percentage as the Northeastern Section of migrants whose schooling stopped at or before reaching the eighth grade. This is a reflection of the relative efficacy of the school systems of the different sections which, in turn, is related to the socio-economic variation of the sections. Only in the urbanized Northeastern Section had the "eighth grade" ceased to be the stopping place for most of the migrants.

TABLE 2.—Male and Female Migrants: Grade in School Finished

Grade in school finished	Total		Western Section		Northeastern Section		Southeastern Section	
	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent
Male migrants								
0- 7.....	55	6.9	13	4.2	33	12.1	9	4.4
8.....	461	58.6	212	68.6	84	30.9	165	80.1
High school {	9.....	32	15	4.9	15	5.5	2	1.0
	10.....	41	10	3.2	25	9.2	6	2.9
	11.....	30	10	3.2	17	6.2	3	1.5
	12.....	100	24	7.9	66	24.3	10	4.8
	13.....	19	6	1.9	8	3.0	5	2.4
College {	14.....	18	7	2.3	9	3.3	2	1.0
	15.....	3	2	0.6	1	0.4	0	0.0
	16.....	28	10	3.2	14	5.1	4	1.9
Total.....	787	100	309	100	272	100	206	100
Unknown.....	7	.....	4	.....	3	.....	0	.....
Grand total.....	794	.....	313	.....	275	.....	206	.....
Female migrants								
0- 7.....	45	5.7	10	3.2	30	10.4	5	2.7
8.....	413	52.5	194	61.8	88	30.6	131	71.2
High school {	9.....	24	7	2.2	12	4.1	5	2.7
	10.....	33	11	3.5	17	5.9	5	2.7
	11.....	33	9	2.9	19	6.6	5	2.7
	12.....	142	38	12.1	88	30.6	16	8.7
	13.....	41	27	8.6	7	2.4	7	3.8
College {	14.....	36	11	3.5	19	6.6	6	3.3
	15.....	5	3	1.0	2	0.7	0	0.0
	16.....	14	4	1.2	6	2.1	4	2.2
Total.....	786	100	314	100	288	100	184	100
Unknown.....	9	.....	1	.....	8	.....	0	.....
Grand total.....	795	.....	315	.....	296	.....	184	.....

Comparison of the sexes reveals that approximately 1 per cent fewer males than females attained eight grades of schooling. More females than males finished high school, but the reverse was true of those finishing college; twice as many females as males had one or two years of college work. This latter circumstance was a result of the greater prevalence of teaching as an occupation among the females; one or two years' schooling beyond high school enabled them to procure positions in their local elementary schools.

## MARITAL STATUS

The percentage of the migrants married varied with the section from which they came; the males varied from 63 per cent in the Northeastern Section to 71 per cent in the Southeastern Section, and the females from 81 per cent to 89 per cent for the same two areas, with the percentage married in the Western Section approximating the average for the three sections (71 per cent for the males and 86 per cent for the females). The percentage married in each section was not correlated with the age of the migrants in the respective sections but was inversely related to the degree of urbanization. The highest percentage married at any specified age was found in the most rural section.

## OCCUPATION

The proportion of the male migrants engaged in agriculture varied from approximately one-half in the Western and Southeastern Sections to one-fifth in the Northeastern Section. The female migrants showed about the same variation except that the percentage in agriculture in all three sections was lower than in the case of the males.

TABLE 3.—Male Migrants: Occupation

	Total		Western Section		Northeastern Section		Southeastern Section	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Farmer.....	287	36	136	43	54	20	97	47
Owner.....	101	13	34	11	31	12	36	18
Renter.....	126	16	74	23	14	5	38	18
Laborer.....	60	7	28	9	9	3	23	11
Non-farmer.....	507	64	177	57	221	80	109	53
Laborer.....	355	45	118	38	161	59	76	37
Business.....	41	5	18	6	14	5	9	4
Clerical and sales.....	59	7	24	8	23	8	12	6
Professional.....	44	6	14	4	20	7	10	5
Occupation unknown..	8	1	3	1	3	1	2	1
Total.....	794	100	313	100	275	100	206	100

Despite the wide variation in percentage of male migrants in agriculture between the Northwestern and Northeastern Sections the proportion of farm owners among the migrants was the same. The variation occurs in the relative percentages of renters and farm laborers; the Northwestern Section had more than four times as many renters and three times as many farm laborers as the Northeastern Section. In the latter section the combination of relatively poor land and proximity of urban opportunity made ownership of land the major inducement that held migrants in agriculture. In

the Western Section where the land was more fertile, many were willing to work as farm laborers or to operate a rented farm. In the Southeastern Section a somewhat different situation prevailed. This section is essentially rural and land relatively cheap; also, opportunities for employment in non-agricultural occupations are not as close at hand as in the other two sections. This section had about the same proportion of owners as renters among the migrants, with a higher percentage of farm laborers than either of the other two sections.

TABLE 4.—Female Migrants: Occupation of Unmarried and of Husbands of Those Married

	Total		Unmarried females Occupation		Married females Occupation of husband	
	<i>Number</i>	<i>Per cent</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Per cent</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Per cent</i>
Farmers.....	279	35	0	0	279	41
Owners.....	50	6	0	0	50	7
Renters.....	50	6	0	0	50	7
Laborers.....	16	2	0	0	16	2
Tenure unknown.....	163	21	0	0	163	24
Non-farmers.....	516	65	112	100	404	59
Laborers.....	207	26	53	48	154	23
Business.....	33	4	1	1	32	5
Clerical and sales.....	43	5	20	18	23	3
Professional.....	44	6	30	27	14	2
Occupation unknown.....	189	24	8	7	181	26
Total.....	795	100	112	100	683	100
Per cent married.....	100	.....	14	.....	86	.....

Thus, it is found that the most urbanized section (Northeastern) had the highest percentage of children of farm parentage in non-agricultural occupations, with the section next in point of urbanization (Western) also next in percentage of emigrants, whereas the most rural section (Southeastern) had the lowest percentage. Since urbanization implies industrialization, it follows then that proximate opportunity for work in non-agricultural occupations has resulted in increased emigration of farm-reared children from agriculture, somewhat in proportion to the degree of urbanization. Other factors complicate the situation somewhat; the Western Section with 50 per cent greater urbanization than the Southeastern Section had but 8 per cent greater emigration from agriculture, partly because of its better soil and resultant more profitable agriculture. Another important factor was that of the culture of the German communities of the Western Section. The rural German culture patterns which have involved, particularly, love of land, relatively closed social organization, endogamous marriage, and relatively meagre schooling of children have resulted

in a higher proportion of their children remaining on the land, at least so long as the culture remains intact and the farms large enough to be sub-divided.

Analysis of the specific occupations of the male migrants entering the non-agricultural occupations reveals no significant variation among the three sections. Computation of the percentage of non-farmers in each specific occupation yields the following:

Occupation <sup>4</sup>	Total	Western Section	Northeastern Section	Southeastern Section
Laborer .....	70.0	66.9	72.8	69.7
Business .....	8.1	10.0	6.3	8.3
Clerical and sales .....	10.6	13.5	10.4	11.0
Professional .....	8.7	7.9	9.1	9.2
Occupation unknown .....	1.6	1.7	1.4	1.8
Total .....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Due to the omission, in the first schedules used in this study, of a question as to the specific occupation of the husbands of the married female migrants, Table 4 contains a considerable percentage with occupation unknown. Attention is called to the relative importance, in point of numbers, of the occupations in which the unmarried females were found. Laborers (factory and domestic) were the largest group with professional workers (teachers and nurses) second in numbers. In the Southeastern Section teachers made up the largest single group.

#### LOCATION

**Type of community.**—The percentage of male migrants living in open country communities was higher than that of females, and a corresponding smaller percentage of them were living in urban locations; the fraction of the migrant population living in villages was the same for both sexes. This difference between the sexes was largely a result of the operation of two factors, the fact that marriage was the chief career of the females and that the "home" farm was more often inherited and operated by a son than by a daughter. The occupation of homemaker, whether as a farmer's wife in the country or as a banker's wife in the city, varies less in its requirements, perhaps, than do the occupations of farming and

<sup>4</sup>Because of the limited number of cases involved, only a very broad classification of occupations has been made. Briefly defined, "Laborer" includes all types of skilled and common labor; "Business," persons who own their own enterprises; "Clerical and Sales," all clerks and salespeople; "Professional" includes physicians, lawyers, teachers, nurses, and ministers. For a more detailed list of the occupations included in these classifications see *Movement of Open Country Population in Ohio*, Rural Sociology Mimeograph Bulletins No. 3, 4, and 5.

banking. At any rate, the probabilities of the female changing from an urban to a rural or from a rural to an urban environment are greater than in the case of the male (2, p. 18).

TABLE 5.—Location of the Migrants: Country, Village,\* and City

Location	Male		Female		Total	
	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent
Open country.....	415	53	387	49	802	51
Village.....	84	11	88	11	172	11
City.....	288	36	318	40	606	38
Total.....	787	100	793	100	1580	100
Unknown.....	7	.....	2	.....	9	.....
Grand total.....	794	.....	795	.....	1589	.....

\*Incorporated place with population under 2500 people.

**Distance from parental home.**—The statements made above apply with equal force to the differences between the sexes with reference to the distance they were located from the parental home at the time the study was made. Because of the greater tendency for the males to remain on the “home” farm more of them were found within short distances of the parental home. While the males were somewhat more likely to have been found at extreme distances (3, p. 594), the females, as a group, lived at a greater average distance than did the males (2, p. 23). One-half of the males lived within 11.4 miles of the parental home and one-half of the females within 16.1 miles. Note the high percentage (82) of the migrants who were less than 100 miles from the place where they were reared.

TABLE 6.—Location of Migrants: Distance in Miles from Parental Home

Location: Miles from parental home	Male		Female		Total	
	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent
0- 2.4.....	306	39	222	28	528	33
2.5- 9.0.....	70	9	87	11	157	10
0- 9.....	376	48	309	39	685	43
10- 19.....	109	14	140	18	249	16
0- 19.....	485	62	449	57	934	59
20- 39.....	78	10	125	16	203	13
40- 59.....	57	7	59	7	116	7
60- 79.....	9	1	13	2	22	1
80- 99.....	16	2	11	1	27	2
0- 99.....	645	82	657	83	1302	82
100-199.....	65	8	74	9	139	9
0-199.....	710	90	731	92	1441	91
200-.....	81	10	61	8	142	9
Total.....	791	100	792	100	1583	100
Unknown.....	3	.....	3	.....	6	.....
Grand total.....	794	.....	795	.....	1589	.....
Median distance.....	11.4	.....	16.1	.....	14.4	.....

### THE RELATION OF MOBILITY TO SELECTED FACTORS

It is valuable but insufficient to know the proportion of adult children who remain in agriculture and the proportion who enter other occupations. It is desirable to know also what circumstances attend this distribution of adult boys and girls among the agricultural and non-agricultural occupations. Does mere chance procedure determine who shall farm and who shall not? Or are there definite factors operating to make it more probable that certain boys and girls shall farm while the remainder seek other occupations? Do certain families contribute a higher proportion of their children to the agricultural occupation than certain other families? What sort of families are these, and what kind of training and equipment for farming do they give their children? These and other related questions are discussed in this section. Let us see what the facts reveal.

#### OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY

**Occupation of parents.**—This refers to occupation of parents at the time the survey was made. The percentage of male migrants in agriculture varied from 42 for the sons of retired farmers to 11 for the sons of non-farmers, with an average of 36 per cent for all groups. Since, among the farmer parents, the retired farmers were the oldest and the farm laborers the youngest, some of the difference in proportion of male children in agriculture was due to difference in the age of the migrants from the various parental occupational groups. Thus, the oldest group, the retired farmers—whose children had attained the greatest average age—had only 2 per cent of its migrants in the occupation of farm laborer; whereas 11 per cent of the sons of farm laborers were themselves farm laborers.<sup>5</sup>

The difference in the age of the migrants from the various parental occupation groups does not explain all the variation seen in Table 7. As the farmer's investment in agriculture increased the more likely were his sons to remain in agriculture.

The female migrants showed little variation in relation to the occupation of their parents, except that those from farm families more often were found in agriculture than those from non-farm families. Within the farm group migrants from Farm Laborer and Renter families were most frequently in agriculture, with the daughters of Retired Farmers a close second. Almost twice as

<sup>5</sup>The data indicate that 30 per cent of the male migrants under 20 years of age were farm laborers as compared with but 5 per cent of the total male migrants.



many female as male migrants from Non-Farm Laborer families married farmers. (Recall that all the female migrants in agriculture entered this occupation by marriage, Table 4). Thus, while parental occupation was significantly correlated with the occupation of male migrants, it was of little influence in determining the occupation of the female migrants.

**Size of parental farm business.**—The size of parental farm business as measured by "total man work units"<sup>6</sup> and number of acres per farm was found to be an important correlative of occupational mobility. "Total man work units" was more significantly related to mobility than to size of farm. Since the former is closely correlated with total capital (4) we may assume that the relationship is truly one between capital involved and mobility. Table 8 indicates the number and percentage of the migrants from farms of varying sized businesses, who were in each of the listed occupations.

The percentage of the migrants engaged in agriculture varied from a low of 25 per cent for those who came from parental farms of less than 100 work units to a high of 58 per cent for those who came from parental farms with 500 or more work units (7). Note that the percentage of renters among the migrants increased with the size of the parental farm business and that there was a similar increase in percentage in clerical and sales positions. The increase in the percentage of farmers as the size of parental business increased was chiefly at the expense of the non-farm laborer group since the percentage in this group varied from 51 to 26 per cent. Only from farms of 400 or more work units were more than one-half of the migrants in agriculture.

Measuring size of farm business by acres per farm gave a very similar picture. The percentage of the male migrants from each size of farm who were in agriculture was as follows:

	Farmers	Non-farmers	Total
Farms less than 100 acres.....	29	71	100
Farms 100-199 acres.....	38	62	100
Farms 200 acres and over.....	68	32	100

Thus, we find in Table 8 good evidence that the percentage of male migrants who remain in agriculture is to a significant degree determined by the size of the parental farm business. The more well-to-do farmer is better able to assist his son to start farming as

<sup>6</sup>A work unit is a measure of work done on crops and animals in terms of a normal day's labor for one man.



TABLE 8.—Male Migrants: Occupation by Size of Parental Farm Business

Total man work units	Occupation										Grand total
	Farmer				Non-farmer						
	Owner	Renter	Laborer	Total	Laborer	Business	Clerical and sales	Profes- sional	Unknown	Total	
<i>Number</i>											
0- 99.....	10	2	11	23	48	6	10	6	1	71	94
100-199.....	18	21	7	46	72	6	10	12	3	103	149
200-299.....	17	15	10	42	53	5	6	7	0	71	113
300-399.....	4	9	8	21	22	4	3	5	0	34	55
400-499.....	8	9	6	23	13	0	6	1	0	20	43
500-.....	1	9	1	11	5	0	3	0	0	8	19
Total.....	58	65	43	166	213	21	38	31	4	307	473
No data*	39	55	12	106	72	17	11	8	3	111	217
Grand total .....	97	120	55	272	285	38	49	39	7	417	690
<i>Per cent</i>											
0- 99.....	11	2	12	25	51	6	11	6	1	75	100
100-199.....	12	14	5	31	48	4	7	8	2	69	100
200-299.....	15	13	9	37	48	4	5	6	0	63	100
300-399.....	7	16	15	38	40	7	6	9	0	62	100
400-499.....	18	21	14	53	31	0	14	2	0	47	100
500-.....	5	48	5	58	26	0	16	0	0	42	100
Total.....	12	14	9	35	45	4	8	7	1	65	100
No data*	18	25	6	49	33	8	5	4	1	51	100
Grand total .....	13	16	7	36	45	5	7	6	1	64	100

\*Included 161 migrants from Farm Laborer and Retired Farmer Families.

a renter or even to give him a farm. In one of the Western townships studied the effects of the custom of giving each son a farm were especially noticeable. The present farmers in this township are of German descent about two generations removed from the original settlers. The original farms have been sub-divided until many of them have become so small that further division is impracticable. As long as there was enough land so that each son could be given a farm most of them stayed in agriculture; since further sub-division of the present farms became inadvisable, migration to other occupations has been increasing at an accelerated rate.

Further evidence that the migrant who stayed in agriculture was the one who received aid from the parental household is seen in the fact that of the 227 male migrants who were farm operators (owners and renters) at the time this study was made, 209 had always been farm operators. Data at hand indicate that at least 80 per cent of this group received parental aid in the form of either money or land. The so-called "agricultural ladder", by which the farm boy climbed from the first rung of "farm laborer" up to the top rung of "farm owner", has ceased in these areas to be the well-traveled road to farm ownership that perhaps it once was. Most of those who could not find a place as owners or renters on farms owned by their fathers, or who received no financial assistance, went into other occupations.

Whereas for the male migrants the percentage farming varied from 25 to 58, increasing with size of farm business as measured by work units, the percentage of female migrants in agriculture varied from 35 to 45 per cent with increasing size of farm business. This factor operated only slightly in determining the occupation group in which the female migrant was found. Since all of the female migrants entered the occupation of farming through marriage, one does not have far to look to discover the explanation of this variation between the sexes. As has been shown previously, the female migrant married into other occupation groups more often than did the male. This fact and tendency for the "home" farm to be operated by a son, regardless of its size, explains most of the difference noted. Another important item is the fact that because of the type of work and of custom, there was little opportunity for any save married females to earn a living in the occupation of farming independent of the parental family.

**Movement history of parental family.**—In general, migrants from families that had changed residences a number of times were more frequently found in non-agricultural occupations than those

from families that had always lived in the same place. Approximately 12 per cent more of the male migrants from families that had changed residences three or four times were found in non-agricultural occupations than from families that never changed their residence. The same relationship held for the female migrants, but the variation was relatively small.

Taking distance moved by the parental family as a criterion, the relationship between amount of movement and the percentage of the migrants in non-agricultural occupations was much more evident. For families that had always lived in the same township the percentage of male migrants farming was 41; for families that had resided in more than one township of the same county, 39; more than one county in the State, 32; and for those that had resided in more than one state in the United States, 27 per cent were farming. Again the female migrants were found to vary in the same direction but to a much less extent than the male migrants.

The above relationship between the spatial movement of the parental family and the percentage of migrants in agriculture is no doubt partially due to the inverse correlation between frequency and distance of movement of the parental family and size of farm business (2, pp. 41, 42). As pointed out above, there was a significant relationship between size of parental farm business and percentage of migrants in agriculture. Stated more simply—the farmers who moved about the most had the smallest farm businesses and the smallest percentage of children who became farmers, and vice versa.

**Occupational history of parental family.**—Since, as has been shown in a previous report (2, p. 45) of this study, families that had been engaged in occupations other than farming moved more frequently than did those that had always farmed, the figures given above suggest that occupational instability of the parental family results in increased migration of its children to non-agricultural occupations. Tables 9 and 10 give data in confirmation of this.

In the above tables the families from which the migrants came are divided into three groups, those that always farmed, those that had experience both as farmers and non-farmers, and those that had never farmed. The variation between the three groups in percentage of migrants farming is wide. The lowest percentage of farmers came from families that had never farmed and the highest percentage from families that had always farmed. Note that there was less variation on this factor among the female migrants than among the male migrants. As has been indicated in the earlier

TABLE 9.—Male Migrants: Occupation by Occupational History of Parental Family

Occupational history of parental family	Occupation										Grand Total
	Farmer				Non-farmer						
	Owner	Renter	Laborer	Total	Laborer	Business	Clerical and sales	Profess- ional	Unknown	Total	
<i>Number</i>											
Always farmed.....	95	115	54	264	235	31	40	33	6	345	609
Farmer and non-farmer.....	5	10	4	19	91	8	12	8	1	120	139
Never farmed.....	1	1	2	4	29	2	7	3	1	42	46
Total.....	101	126	60	287	355	41	59	44	8	507	794
<i>Per cent</i>											
Always farmed.....	15	19	9	43	39	5	7	5	1	57	100
Farmer and non-farmer.....	4	7	3	14	65	6	8	6	1	86	100
Never farmed.....	2	2	5	9	63	4	15	7	2	91	100
Total.....	13	16	7	36	45	5	7	6	1	64	100

report on this study (2, 45), families that had changed from agriculture to other occupations and the converse had moved more frequently and over greater distances than those that had remained in one occupation and at the same time had a smaller average size of farm business. Thus, the factor of occupational change is inter-correlated with size of farm business, and the variation noted above is at least partially a function of size of business. The group that had always farmed had the larger average farm business; the group that had changed from farming to other occupations, and vice versa, consisted of non-farmers who had at some time been farmers and farmers with a smaller average farm business than those that always farmed.

**TABLE 10.—Married Female Migrants\*: Occupation of Husband by Occupational History of Parental Family**

Occupational history of parental family	Number			Per cent		
	Farmer	Non-farmer	Total	Farmer	Non-farmer	Total
Always farmed.....	245	276	521	47	53	100
Farmer and non-farmer...	28	85	113	25	75	100
Never farmed.....	6	43	49	12	88	100
Total.....	279	404	683	41	59	100

\*All of the unmarried female migrants were non-farmers.

**Supplementary occupation of parental family.**—Some study was made of the relation of the supplementary occupations of the parental family to the subsequent occupation of the migrants. Five per cent more of the male migrants from farm families occupied solely in farming were found in agriculture than from families that had another (supplementary) occupation. The female migrants showed no significant variation on this factor. With the tendency for a majority of the migrants to enter non-farm occupations it might be expected that those from families that were engaged to some extent in such occupations would show more of the tendency to become non-farmers than those from families engaged solely in agriculture.

**Inheritance of farm by parental family.**—Male migrants from farm families that had inherited the farm on which they were living were found in agriculture with 5 per cent greater frequency than those from families that had bought their farms. Other factors complicate this relationship. In the Western Section where farms most often remained in the same family for several generations through inheritance, the number of children in the parental

family was the largest. Thus, if every farm was inherited by a son, the percentage of sons who had to look elsewhere for employment was large. In the Northeastern Section migration was much higher and the family size much smaller. Many of the farms in that section passed into the hands of operators of foreign origin. The Southeastern Section showed considerable abandonment of farms despite inheritance, because of the relative infertility of the land.

**Schooling of parents.**—Migrants from families in which one of the principals had more than eight grades of schooling were found in non-farm occupations more frequently than those from families in which the principals had less schooling. There was but little difference between the male and female migrants in this respect (Table 11). Although the percentage of the total migrants that came from families in which either the father or mother had more than eight grades of schooling was small, the decidedly lower percentage of this group found in agriculture is significant. The difference was constant regardless of the sex of the migrants or

TABLE 11.—Migrants: Occupation by Schooling of Parents

Grade in school	Occupation					
	Farmer		Non-farmer		Total	
	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent
Male						
Father						
8th or less .....	280	38	463	62	743	100
9th or more .....	7	14	44	86	51	100
Total .....	287	36	507	64	794	100
Female						
8th or less .....	272	36	489	64	761	100
9th or more .....	7	21	27	79	34	100
Total .....	279	35	516	65	795	100
Male						
Mother						
8th or less .....	275	37	468	63	743	100
9th or more .....	12	19	39	81	51	100
Total .....	287	36	507	64	794	100
Female						
8th or less .....	270	36	473	64	743	100
9th or more .....	9	19	43	81	52	100
Total .....	279	34	516	66	795	100

whether the schooling of the father or mother was taken as the criterion. Since schooling of the parents was reflected in the schooling of the migrants (a larger percentage of children from families in which at least one of the parents had more than eight grades of schooling had more than an eight-grade education than those from families in which the parents had less schooling), this differential is partially due to variation in the schooling of the migrants from the two groups of families. As will be shown later (Table 18), migrants with more than eight grades of schooling were less often engaged in agriculture than those with less schooling. Another disturbing factor is that a number of the migrants from families whose principals had more than eighth-grade training came from non-farm families; thus, their occupation was influenced by the occupation of their parents (Table 7).

**Organization affiliation of parental family.**—Families that were affiliated with religious or social organizations<sup>7</sup> kept their children in the open country and in the occupation of agriculture more often than did those with no such affiliation. Approximately one-third of all migrants came from families that admitted affiliation with no organization. The percentage of the migrants in farm and non-farm occupations from families with and without some organization affiliation was as follows:

Organization affiliation of parental family	Male migrants		Female migrants	
	Farmer	Non-farmer	Farmer	Non-farmer
Some .....	38	62	35	65
None .....	33	67	32	68
Total.....	36	64	34	66

Although the differences are not large they are apparently significant, since they hold for each of the three Sections taken separately. As for most of the correlatives of occupation given previously, the difference was greater for the male than for the female migrants. Families that supported local organizations were as a rule the more stable families of the community in which they lived; transient families that moved a great deal, both in space and from one occupation to another showed less interest in organizations and held memberships in them less often (2, p. 44).

<sup>7</sup>Affiliation as used here implies membership of at least one person in the household in at least one organization, such as Church, Farm Bureau, Grange, Lodge, and Farmers' Clubs, or any other organizations exclusive of purely commercial ones.

**Number of children in parental family.**—The question naturally arises as to what effect the size of the parental family (as measured by number of children) has upon the proportion of the migrants that enters farming and the non-farming occupations. Although there was considerable fluctuation, Table 12 indicates that there was a slight tendency for the percentage of male migrants in agriculture to increase with increasing size of family up to families with eight children and to decrease with any increase in family size above this figure. Migrants from families of 12 or more came from farms with a 40 per cent larger business than migrants from families of 11 children (recall that the percentage of male migrants in agriculture was positively correlated with size of farm business, Table 8).

**TABLE 12.—Migrants: Occupation by Number of Children in Parental Family**

Number of children in parental family	Occupation					
	Number			Per cent		
	Farmer	Non-farmer	Total	Farmer	Non-farmer	Total
Male						
1.....	7	12	19	37	63	100
2.....	24	46	70	34	66	100
3.....	26	63	89	29	71	100
4.....	34	65	99	34	66	100
5.....	33	62	95	35	65	100
6.....	42	52	94	45	55	100
7.....	42	56	98	43	57	100
8.....	34	38	72	47	53	100
9.....	18	22	40	45	55	100
10.....	11	26	37	30	70	100
11.....	3	22	25	12	88	100
12 or more.....	13	38	51	25	75	100
Total.....	287	507	794	36	64	100
Female						
1.....	1	10	11	9	91	100
2.....	25	38	63	40	60	100
3.....	27	67	94	29	71	100
4.....	29	71	100	29	71	100
5.....	31	56	87	36	64	100
6.....	38	73	111	34	66	100
7.....	44	59	103	43	57	100
8.....	25	41	66	38	62	100
9.....	15	29	44	34	66	100
10.....	17	32	49	35	65	100
11.....	4	16	20	20	80	100
12 or more.....	23	24	47	49	51	100
Total.....	279	516	795	35	65	100

Although the correlation between size of farm business and number of children born to farm families was low, it was a factor in producing the distribution seen in Table 12. The average number of work units varied from 200 for one-child families to 360 for



families of 12 or more children. The percentage of the male migrants in agriculture varied from 37 per cent for one-child families to 47 per cent for eight-child families (a 28 per cent change); the average number of work units varied from 200 for one-child families to 260 for eight-child families (a 30 per cent change). The variation here is not sufficiently pronounced to be conclusive, however, and it is quite possible that further study will show this factor to be of little or no significance. Nevertheless, in view of the fact that a high percentage of the migrants who entered farming did so near home and with the aid of their parents, the logic of the situation seems to be that, other things being equal, the larger the number of children in the family the smaller the proportion that will enter the occupation of farming.

The case is somewhat clearer for female migrants. The data show the same general trend as that for males with less variation, if we except the violent fluctuations in the percentages for migrants from one- and two-child families. Since the percentage of female migrants in agriculture varied less than that for the male migrants with respect to variation in the size of the parental farm business, we would expect them to vary less with regard to size of family, if our explanation is correct and no new factors enter. Since the female migrants came from the same group of families as the males the figures given above on size of parental farm business apply likewise to them. The total migrant population has been included in this analysis even though the data on size of farm business were available for only those migrants from farm families. Separate analysis of the farm migrants gave no different results since most of the migrants were from farm families (page 5).

**Order of birth.**—No evidence was found in this study of any tendency for the male first born in a family to remain in agriculture more often than subsequent children. In fact, the male first born was found in the occupation of farming less often than any other child, but the difference was slight.<sup>8</sup>

With respect to the females, however, it was found that the percentage in agriculture decreased with increasing order of birth. Of the females first born 39 per cent were in agriculture; whereas of the females born seventh and subsequently only 26 per cent were in agriculture.

Combining the data on order of birth and number of children in the parental family and figuring the percentage in farming and in non-agricultural occupations according to the number of younger

---

<sup>8</sup>Zimmerman and his associates have presented some evidence of the operation of primogeniture in Virginia and Minnesota. Their data are not strictly comparable with those of this analysis, however. (See 8 and 9).

TABLE 13.—Male Migrants: Occupation by Age

Age in years	Occupation										Grand total
	Farm				Non-farm						
	Owner	Renter	Laborer	Total	Laborer	Business	Clerical and sales	Profes- sional	Unknown	Total	
<i>Number</i>											
Under 20 .....	0	1	13	14	23	1	4	2	0	30	44
20-29 .....	18	50	30	98	187	12	30	16	3	248	346
30-39 .....	48	58	10	116	84	18	14	15	1	132	248
40- .....	35	17	7	59	60	10	11	11	1	93	152
Unknown .....	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	4	4
Total .....	101	126	60	287	355	41	59	44	7	507	794
<i>Per cent</i>											
Under 20 .....	0	2	30	32	52	2	9	5	0	68	100
20-29 .....	5	14	9	28	54	3	9	5	1	72	100
30-39 .....	19	24	4	47	34	7	6	6	*	53	100
40- .....	23	11	5	39	39	7	7	7	1	61	100
Total .....	13	16	7	36	45	5	7	6	1	64	100

\*Less than 1 per cent.

brothers and sisters each migrant had threw some further light on factors within the parental household that influenced choice of occupation. In the case of males, there was a slight tendency for the percentage in agriculture to decrease as the number of younger brothers and sisters increased. In the case of females, however, the opposite trend was marked; the percentage in agriculture was greatest for those who had the largest number of younger brothers and sisters and least for those with the least number. The percentage in agriculture ranged from 75 for those females having 12 or more younger brothers and sisters to 28 for those having less than two younger brothers and sisters. A suggested explanation of this situation is that the older girl in a family where there were a large number of younger children was much more of an asset to that family because of the amount of household labor to be done than a later-born female or the female in a family with fewer younger children. She was in all probability given less education because she was needed at home. Younger children in the same family or children from smaller families who were not so urgently needed at home may have received more schooling, were frequently employed outside the parental home, and as a result married less often into the occupation of farming. On the other hand, the older girl, having had more domestic experience, may be preferred as a mate by farm boys intending to stay on the farm.

**Age of the migrants.**—Male migrants who were 30 or more years of age were in agriculture to a much greater extent than those under the age of 30 years. The higher percentage of those under 20 years than of those 20 to 29 years of age in agriculture was due entirely to age differences: most of those in the former group who were in agriculture were farm laborers and had but recently started for themselves. Judging from the occupational history of the total group (Table 13), not more than two-thirds of them will remain in agriculture.

Further analysis indicates that age of the male migrants was significantly related to mobility only in so far as it determined the period in which they started for themselves. Tabulation of the percentage of the male migrants in agriculture by the period of years in which those of different ages migrated gives the following:

Year	Occupation		
	Farmer	Non-farmer	Total
1919-1928.....	32	68	100
1909-1918.....	45	55	100
1899-1908.....	40	60	100
Before 1899.....	27	73	100
Total.....	36	64	100

Note that the migrants that started for themselves during the period (1909-1918) of prosperous economic conditions in agriculture were most frequently found in that occupation. The lowest percentage of farmers came from among those that migrated before 1899 (there was a serious agricultural depression in the last decade of the 19th century); while the percentage of farmers among those that migrated after the World War and during the present agricultural depression was almost as low. If the fact that many of the migrants that started for themselves during the decade 1919-1928 were young and as a result had not yet chosen the occupation in which they will eventually be found were taken into consideration, it is probable that one could safely predict that not over 25 per cent of them will be in agriculture 10 years after their migration from the parental home. We may conclude, then, that the percentage of males from farm families that remained in agriculture was noticeably influenced by the relative economic condition of the farming industry at the time the migrants started for themselves (1).

It was also found that a much higher percentage of those females who left home prior to 1919 were in agriculture than of those that migrated after that date. But the females differed from the males in that they did not show the corresponding response to changes in the economic conditions in agriculture to any very noticeable extent. The youngest migrants were in agriculture least frequently, and those 40 years of age and older most frequently. Inasmuch as all of the unmarried female migrants were in occupations classed as non-agricultural, the percentage in agriculture was less among the younger groups. The opportunities for a career other than marriage have been increasing with increased urbanization of the State, and the decline of the belief that woman's only place is in the home. Truly, many of those who became laborers in factories, clerical workers, teachers, and nurses later married. But those who did marry seldom married farmers; this was particularly true for those whose work was in a city, as we shall show later. The extremely small percentage of female migrants under 20 years of age in agriculture was, no doubt, due to their age and the fact that most of them were single; a small percentage of them will undoubtedly marry farmers. Our data indicate, then, a tendency toward a secular decline in the percentage of female migrants from open country families entering agriculture, probably due to the increasing opportunities allowed them, in a changing social order, for careers of a different sort.

TABLE 14.—Female Migrants: Occupation by Age

Age	Farmer	Non-farmer	Total
<i>Number</i>			
0-19.....	9	44	53
20-29.....	107	250	357
30-39.....	109	156	265
40-.....	54	63	117
Unknown.....	0	3	3
Total.....	279	516	795
<i>Per cent</i>			
0-19.....	17	83	100
20-29.....	30	70	100
30-39.....	41	59	100
40-.....	46	54	100
Total.....	35	65	100

**Age at starting for self.**—Male migrants who started for themselves at an early age (under 20) were found in agriculture less frequently than those who migrated later in life. Of those found in agriculture, migrants who were farm operators (owners and renters) started for themselves later than did those who were farm laborers. Of course, many of those who started for themselves before reaching the age of 20 years were relatively young at the time the study was made and fewer of them had become established in the occupation that they would eventually follow. Allowing for this variation in age the trend indicated in Table 15 would remain essentially the same.

The highest percentages of laborers (both farm and non-farm) were found among those migrants who started for themselves at an early age. Thus, the occupations followed by the migrants were related to the extent and nature of the training (schooling and practical experience) they had received before leaving the parental home (3, chap. 26). The group that started for itself immediately after finishing high school (at 18-19 years) contained the highest percentage of clerical and sales people; that which started at an age advanced enough for the completion of a college course (at 24-25 years) contained the highest percentage of professional workers.

The female migrants showed essentially the same tendencies as the male with respect to this factor. Those employed before marriage migrated at an earlier average age than those whose migration was coincident with their marriage. For both male and female migrants, the data indicate that, in general, the earlier the age of migration the greater is the likelihood of a non-agricultural occupation.

TABLE 15.—Male Migrants: Occupation by Age at Starting for Self

Age at starting for self	Occupation										Grand total
	Farmer				Non-farmer						
	Owner	Renter	Laborer	Total	Laborer	Business	Clerical and sales	Profes- sional	Unknown	Total	
Number											
Under 16 .....	2	1	1	4	10	0	0	0	0	10	14
16-17 .....	2	4	8	14	34	1	3	5	0	43	57
18-19 .....	12	14	15	41	94	15	18	8	3	138	179
20-21 .....	45	58	26	129	136	10	24	13	2	185	314
22-23 .....	18	17	5	40	37	5	7	5	0	54	94
24-25 .....	9	14	4	27	17	4	5	8	0	34	61
26 .....	11	16	0	27	12	4	1	2	0	19	46
Unknown .....	2	2	1	5	15	2	1	3	3	24	29
Total.....	101	126	60	287	355	41	59	44	8	507	794
Per cent											
Under 16 .....	14	7	7	28	72	0	0	0	0	72	100
16-17 .....	4	7	14	25	60	1	5	9	0	75	100
18-19 .....	7	8	8	23	53	8	10	4	2	77	100
20-21 .....	14	19	8	41	43	3	8	4	1	59	100
22-23 .....	19	18	6	43	40	5	7	5	0	57	100
24-25 .....	15	23	6	44	28	7	8	13	0	56	100
26 .....	24	35	0	59	26	9	2	4	0	41	100
Total.....	13	16	7	36	45	5	7	6	1	64	100

**Initial occupation.**—The occupation in which the migrant was engaged at the time he ceased to be dependent upon the parental family was related to his subsequent occupational mobility. Computing the percentages (Table 16) it is found that 80 per cent of those male migrants who were initially in the occupation of farming were still farming at the time this study was made. The comparable figure for those starting for themselves in non-agricultural occupations was 94 per cent. The farm laborer group was the least stable, only 37 per cent of those starting for themselves as farm laborers remaining in that group; of the remaining two-thirds, one-half had become owners or renters and the other one-half non-farmers. The most stable group was the owners; 95 per cent of those starting for themselves as owners remained in their initial occupation.

It is evident from the above figures that the probability of a farmer changing to a non-farm occupation decreased as his stake in farming increased. In a period of high rural-urban migration such as we have experienced in Ohio, the boy most likely to have remained in the occupation of farming was the one whose father was able and willing to establish him in the industry as an owner or to rent him a farm that he could eventually own. Recall that in the Northeastern Section, where migration from agriculture was greatest, the majority of the male migrants that remained in agriculture were owners.

Marriage was by far the most frequent career of female migrants, 71 per cent of whom had no occupation previous to becoming homemakers. Another 15 per cent married after pursuing some occupation for a few years, making a total of 86 per cent who were married at time this study was made. Of those who started for themselves as laborers, 43 per cent later married. Of those whose initial occupation was in the professional group (teachers and nurses), 67 per cent married, all except 7 of them abandoning their premarital occupation. Aside from the shift of 5 individuals who changed from the professional to other occupational groups (Table 17) no occupational shift, except that from other occupations to homemaker, was indicated by the data of this study.

TABLE 16.—Male Migrants: Percentage in Each Occupation by Initial Occupation

Occupation at time of survey	Initial occupation									Grand total
	Farmer				Non-farmer					
	Total	Owner	Renter	Laborer	Total	Laborer	Business	Clerical and sales	Professional	
Per cent										
Farmer—total .....	80	96	87	67	6	6	5	5	6	36
Owner .....	28	95	16	12	2	2	5	0	4	13
Renter .....	36	1	71	18	2	2	0	2	2	16
Laborer .....	16	0	0	37	2	2	0	3	0	7
Non-farmer—total .....	20	4	13	33	94	94	95	95	94	64
Laborer .....	13	2	8	22	67	86	10	7	2	45
Business .....	4	0	2	6	6	3	65	0	6	5
Clerical and sales .....	2	2	2	4	10	3	10	86	6	7
Professional .....	1	0	1	1	9	1	0	0	74	6
Unknown .....	0	0	0	0	2	1	10	2	6	1
Grand total—Per cent .....	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Number .....	325	58	128	139	469	357	20	42	5	794



TABLE 17.—Female Migrants: Occupation by Initial Occupation†

Occupation at time of survey	Initial occupation						Total	
	Non-farm laborer	Business	Clerical and sales	Professional	Homemaker	Unknown	Number	Per cent
Non-farm laborer.....	52	0	0	1	0	.....	53	7
Business.....	0	0	0	1	0	.....	1	*
Clerical and sales.....	0	0	17	3	0	.....	20	2
Professional.....	0	0	0	30	0	.....	30	4
Homemaker.....	39	0	8	72	564	.....	683	86
Occupation unknown.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	8	8	1
Total.....	91	0	25	107	564	8	795	100

\*Less than 1 per cent.

†Table reads vertically or horizontally.

**Parental home of wife or husband.**—The male migrant who married a country girl remained in agriculture much more often than one who married a girl whose home was in a village or city. Of those whose wives were from the open country, 56 per cent were in agriculture, as compared with 10 and 9 per cent, respectively, of those who married village and city girls. Or to state it in another manner, 94 per cent of the male migrants who remained in agriculture married girls from the open country. The remaining 6 per cent was composed of 2 per cent who married village girls and 4 per cent who married city girls. All of those male migrants on farms who had obtained their wives in cities (8 in number) were living on farms that they had inherited or expected to inherit. Of those who married village girls 69 per cent were non-farm laborers, as compared with 30 per cent of those who married girls from the open country and 55 per cent of those who married city girls.

While it is true that some of the differentiation in occupation with respect to whether the wife came from an open country, village, or city environment was due to the fact that many of the migrants married after leaving the farm, the data at hand establish the fact that nothing short of an opportunity to own land through inheritance induced those migrants who married girls from cities to remain in or return to agriculture as an occupation.<sup>9</sup>

In nearly every case the country girl who married a man from a non-agricultural environment moved from the open country to that environment. In two cases farm girls married and remained on inherited land, their husbands making the necessary occupational change. In both these instances the husbands were born and reared on farms.

<sup>9</sup>Since the wholehearted cooperation of the wife is an important factor in the financial success of the farm enterprise, it is not surprising that the urban-bred girl is seldom a farmer's wife. Her training and point of view are less likely to be favorable than that of the country girl. (See 6, p. 8).

**Schooling.**—Considerable discussion has centered about the relative mentality of rural emigrants and those that remain on farms. So far as this study is concerned no attempt will be made to pass upon the mental ability or intelligence of any group. Schooling, used here to indicate the number of years of formal education received, was significantly related to the ratio between farm and non-farm migrants. The eighth grade was the maximum schooling attained by 83 per cent of the male migrants in agriculture, as compared with 56 per cent of those in non-agricultural occupations. Among the farmers, 76 per cent of the owners, 85 per cent of the renters, and 80 per cent of the farm laborers stopped their schooling at or before finishing the eighth grade. Comparable figures for the non-farmers were: laborers 66 per cent, business men 61 per cent, clerical and sales people 29 per cent, and those in the professions 11 per cent.

The highest percentage of farmers came from the group with eight grades of schooling, with those who had less than eight grades furnishing the next highest percentage. The majority of the latter group were laborers (18 per cent farm and 60 per cent non-farm laborers). Of those that had more than eight grades of schooling approximately 21 per cent were farmers. Those who had from 12 to 15 grades of schooling were farming in about 25 per cent of the cases; whereas less than 20 per cent of those finishing 9 to 11 grades were found in agriculture. The latter group, who entered high school but failed to finish, were among the non-farm laborers more frequently than any of the other migrants. Only one of the 28 college graduates was farming; he returned, after 2 years as a vocational teacher, to a farm owned by his father.

The percentage of the non-farmers in the so-called "white collar jobs" increased with amount of schooling, the fraction in clerical and sales positions reaching a maximum of 25 per cent for those with 1-3 years of college, and that of professional workers reaching a maximum of 75 per cent for college graduates.

The amount of schooling received by the migrants was related to the age of the migrants, as was the proportion entering agriculture. Tabulation of the schooling of the male migrants according to the period in which they left home gave the following results:

	1919-1928	1909-1918	1899-1908	Before 1899
	<i>Pct.</i>	<i>Pct.</i>	<i>Pct.</i>	<i>Pct.</i>
0-8 grades .....	56	77	76	73
9 or more grades.....	44	23	24	27

TABLE 18.—Male Migrants: Occupation by Grade in School Finished

Grade in school finished	Occupation										Grand total
	Farmer				Non-farmer						
	Owner	Renter	Laborer	Total	Laborer	Business	Clerical and sales	Profes- sional	Unknown	Total	
<i>Number</i>											
0- 7.....	1	8	10	19	33	0	1	0	2	36	55
8.....	76	99	38	213	201	25	16	5	1	248	461
9-11.....	8	5	5	18	63	5	11	5	1	85	103
12.....	11	10	4	25	46	6	18	4	1	75	100
13-15.....	5	3	3	11	7	3	10	9	0	29	40
16 or more.....	0	1	0	1	2	2	2	21	0	27	28
Unknown .....	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	3	7	7
Total.....	101	126	60	287	355	41	59	44	8	507	794
<i>Per cent</i>											
0- 7.....	2	15	18	35	60	0	2	0	3	65	100
8.....	17	21	8	46	44	5	4	1	*	54	100
9-11.....	8	5	5	18	61	5	10	5	1	82	100
12.....	11	10	4	25	46	6	18	4	1	75	100
13-15.....	12	8	8	28	17	8	25	22	0	72	100
16 or more.....	0	4	0	4	7	7	7	75	0	96	100
Total.....	13	16	7	36	45	5	7	6	1	64	100

\*Less than 1 per cent.

Note that the percentage of the migrants who had no high school training was highest for those who started for themselves between 1899-1918 and lowest for those that migrated between 1919-1928. The trend shown in this tabulation is especially significant when related to the previous tabulation showing the percentage of the migrants in each period that became farmers. The period in which the greatest percentage of the migrants became farmers also had the largest percentage of migrants with no high school training. It does not follow from this, however, that all of the variation in percentage farming was caused by the variation in the schooling of the migrants. Schooling no doubt was a factor, but it can hardly explain the entire difference. Perhaps both the degree of schooling of the migrants and the proportion entering agriculture were influenced by some common cause, such as the relative economic condition of agriculture; that is, when farming is prosperous it may be that children, especially boys, drop out of school earlier and enter farming in larger numbers. Then, too, the attitude of farmers who desire their children to get a good education is likely to be less pronounced in periods of prosperity.

Schooling was also related to the occupation in which the female migrants were found. The percentage of married female migrants varied inversely with the number of grades of schooling attained. All the female migrants with less than 8 grades of schooling were married, the percentage decreasing to a minimum of 50 for those who had graduated from college. Some of the variation in percentage married was due to age differences, but the data clearly indicate that the higher the level of schooling the less likely was marriage to have been the sole career and the greater the likelihood of the migrant remaining unmarried. As in the case of the male migrants, the group that entered high school but failed to graduate (9-11 grades) had the highest percentage of laborers. Similarly those with 13-15 grades of schooling were most frequently in the clerical and sales group, and those who had graduated from college most frequently in the professions.

Considering the female migrants from the standpoint of the proportion in farm and non-farm occupation groups according to grade in school finished we find the following percentages:

Grade finished	Farm	Non-farm	Total
0-7.....	28	62	100
8.....	41	59	100
9-11.....	30	70	100
12.....	30	70	100
13-15.....	35	65	100
16.....	14	86	100
Total .....	35	65	100

As in the case of the male migrants, those whose schooling stopped at the eighth grade were most frequently in agriculture, the percentage in agriculture decreasing with increased schooling, except that those with 13 to 15 grades of schooling were in agriculture more often than any other except the eighth-grade group. This variation resulted from the circumstance that most of the rural school teachers were included in the 13-15-grade group, many of whom eventually married farmers. Those who worked in other occupations, because of the location of their jobs there, moved to villages or cities more often than did teachers, and, as a result, married into the occupation of farming less often than did the latter group.

Comparing the percentage of the female migrants in agriculture by the period in which they started for themselves with the percentage at each period who had no high school training, a more striking relationship is found between the two than in the case of the male migrants. These percentages were:

	1919-1928	1909-1918	1899-1908	Before 1899	Total
	<i>Pct.</i>	<i>Pct.</i>	<i>Pct.</i>	<i>Pct.</i>	<i>Pct.</i>
No high school training .....	47	72	75	87	58
Farming .....	27	36	39	46	35

The highest percentage of female migrants remaining in the occupation of farming occurred during the period before 1899. During this period, also, occurred the largest percentage of female migrants who started for themselves without high school training. The level of schooling rose in each succeeding period, but the percentage remaining in agriculture declined.

Apparently, the increased amount of schooling secured by females in recent years has been an important factor in bringing about the decline in the percentage in agriculture, or, perhaps one should look beyond the mere fact of amount of schooling for the explanation. The more liberal attitude of parents toward the possibility that their daughters might be employed in occupations other than that of wife and homemaker may be responsible for both increased schooling and indirectly for increased emigration from agriculture.

#### SPATIAL MOBILITY

In discussing the movement of the migrants from place to place it is necessary to approach the subject from two angles: (a) type of community in which the migrants located, and (b) distance they had moved from the parental home.

## TYPE OF COMMUNITY

It will be recalled (Table 5) that of the 1589 migrants, 51 per cent were living in the open country, 11 per cent in villages, and 38 per cent in cities. This distribution of the migrants according to type of community was influenced by several factors, particularly, occupation, initial location after starting for self, section of the State, and date of migration.

**Occupation.**—Naturally the occupations in which the migrants were found had determined to a large extent their location. Practically all of the farmers were living in the open country. Of those engaged in non-agricultural occupations, approximately one-fourth was living in the open country, one-sixth in villages, and the remainder in cities.

TABLE 19.—Male Migrants: Location by Occupation

Occupation	Location									
	Open country		Village		City		Unknown		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Farmer:										
Owner.....	100	99	1	1	0	0	0	0	101	100
Renter.....	125	99	0	0	1	1	0	0	126	100
Laborer.....	59	98	1	2	0	0	0	0	60	100
Total.....	284	99	2	1	1	*	0	0	287	100
Non-farmer:										
Laborer.....	103	29	56	16	194	54	2	1	355	100
Business.....	11	27	10	24	20	49	0	0	41	100
Clerical and sales.....	7	12	10	17	42	71	0	0	59	100
Professional...	9	20	5	11	28	64	2	5	44	100
Unknown.....	1		1		3		3		8	
Total.....	131	26	82	16	287	57	7	1	507	100
Grand total.....	415	52	84	11	288	36	7	1	794	100

\*Less than 0.5 of 1 per cent.

TABLE 20.—Female Migrants: Location by Occupation

Occupation*	Location			
	Open country	Village	City	Total
<i>Number</i>				
Farmer.....	268	6	5	279
Non-farmer.....	119	82	313	514
Total.....	387	88	318	793†
<i>Per cent</i>				
Farmer.....	96	2	2	100
Non-farmer.....	23	16	61	100
Total.....	49	11	40	100

\*Husband's occupation for married females.

†No data on 2 of the migrants.

Nearly four-fifths of the male migrants who were living in the open country and working at non-agricultural occupations were laborers. This fact discloses an interesting development that has taken place in Ohio and under similar conditions elsewhere. Particularly in the more urbanized areas, an increasing number of persons have been holding their residence in the open country and working in nearby towns and cities. The advent of the automobile and good roads have made this possible. Many of the younger migrants included in this study were living with their parents and working in nearby towns. Distances of 15 miles between residence and work were common, and a few lived as far as 30 miles from their work.

Another factor in the increase of number of non-farmers among the open country population has been the increasing demand for labor in the open country and in nearby villages to man the various service agencies. Filling stations, garages, and stores claimed many migrants, either as laborers or clerks, or as proprietors. Rural school teachers usually came from open country families.

More than two-thirds of the migrants living in the open country were farmers. As a result of this high relationship between farming as an occupation and the open country as a place of residence, most of the factors enumerated under "Occupational Mobility" were related to the percentage of the migrants living in the open country, the only difference being that 17 per cent more of them were living in the open country than were farming. Because of this relationship no detailed analysis of the factors enumerated under "Occupational Mobility" is made in this section except as they warrant further conclusions or show relationships at variance with those set forth in the latter section.

**Section of the State.**—The percentage of the migrants living in villages was about the same in all three Sections of the State. There was considerable variation in the Sections of the State with respect to the proportion of migrants living in the country, however. The most urbanized section (Northeastern) had 45 per cent of all its migrants in the open country; the Western Section was next with 50 per cent; whereas the most rural section (Southeastern) had 56 per cent of its migrants in the open country. Both sexes were included in the above figures since their sectional variation was similar.

The percentage of non-farmer migrants living in the open country was relatively low for the Western and Southeastern Sections, but more than one-half of the migrants from the Northeast-

ern Section who were living in the open country were non-farmers. This was true for both sexes and was due to the disposition to live in the country within commuting distance and work in the industrial cities of this region.

**Initial location<sup>10</sup>.**—The majority of the migrants were located (at the time of this study) in the same type of community as that in which they were initially located. This was particularly true of the female migrants. Of the 480 male migrants who were initially located in the open country, 82 per cent remained in the open country, 5 per cent later migrated to villages, and 13 per cent to cities.

TABLE 21.—Migrants: Location by Initial Location

Initial location	Location							
	Male migrants				Female migrants			
	Open country	Village	City	Total	Open country	Village	City	Total
<i>Number</i>								
Open country.....	393	23	64	480	381	4	10	395
Village.....	5	56	11	72	4	82	9	95
City.....	17	5	213	235	2	2	299	303
Total.....	415	84	288	787*	387	88	318	793*
<i>Per cent</i>								
Open country.....	82	5	13	100	97	1	2	100
Village.....	7	78	15	100	4	86	10	100
City.....	7	2	91	100	1	1	98	100
Total.....	53	11	36	100	49	11	40	100

\*The location of 7 males and 2 females was not known; so these totals do not check with the number of individuals included in this study, 794 males and 795 females.

Of the 72 male migrants who were initially in villages, 78 per cent had remained there, 7 per cent had returned to the open country<sup>11</sup>, and 15 per cent had migrated to cities. Out of the 235 initially in cities, 91 per cent remained, 2 per cent later moved to villages, and 7 per cent returned to the open country (Table 21). The female migrants showed similar behavior except that more of them remained in their initial location. Approximately 11 per cent

<sup>10</sup>“Initial location”, as used below, was the residence of the migrant immediately after he had started for himself; for example, if an individual, whose parental home was in the open country, secured his first job in a village and, as a result, immediately left home to live in that village, his “initial location” was tabulated as “village”. But, if the same individual continued to live with his parents in the open country, even though his place of employment was in the village, his initial location was tabulated as “open country”. Location as used here indicates residence, not the location of work.

<sup>11</sup>Recall that all of the migrants came from open country families.



of the migrants living in cities had migrated there by way of the village. Thus, 89 per cent proceeded directly from the open country to the city (3, p. 594).

TABLE 22.—Migrants: Origin by Present Location

Initial location	Location							
	Male migrants				Female migrants			
	Open country	Village	City	Total	Open country	Village	City	Total
<i>Number</i>								
Open country.....	393	23	64	480	381	4	10	395
Village.....	5	56	11	72	4	82	9	95
City.....	17	5	213	235	2	2	299	303
Total.....	415	84	288	787*	387	88	318	793*
<i>Per cent</i>								
Open country.....	95	27	22	61	98	5	3	50
Village.....	1	67	4	9	1	93	3	12
City.....	4	6	74	30	1	2	94	38
Total.....	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

\*The location of 7 males and 2 females was not known; so these totals do not check with the number of individuals included in this study, 794 males and 795 females.

Note (Table 22) that 95 per cent of the male and 98 per cent of the female migrants who were located in the open country had initially located there. It is evident that the initial location of these migrants determined for most of them the location in which they would continue to live. Analysis of these data by age of the migrants confirms the above statement. The females, who moved from the open country to villages and cities more frequently than the males, showed less tendency to move from one type of location to another after they had once established their own residence away from the parental home.

**Date of migration.**—The period of years in which the migrants started for themselves was apparently just as important a factor in determining their location as it was in determining the occupation pursued. The percentage of the migrants of the different periods found living in open country, village, and city locations was as follows:

Location	Date of migration			
	1919-1928	1909-1918	1899-1908	Before 1899
Male migrants				
Open country.....	52	56	52	38
Village.....	12	7	14	4
City.....	36	37	34	58
Total.....	100	100	100	100
Female migrants				
Open country.....	47	49	54	60
Village.....	12	13	7	0
City.....	41	38	39	40
Total.....	100	100	100	100

Attention is called to the fact that, among the male migrants, the group with the largest portion of its members living in the open country migrated during the period of greatest agricultural prosperity. There were fewer non-farmers among the open country residents of this group than for other groups that started for themselves when agriculture was in a less favorable economic condition. It would appear, then, that the relative economic condition of agriculture at the time that the male migrants started for themselves influenced not only the percentage entering farm and non-farm occupations and the percentage taking up residence in the open country but, in addition, affected the relative percentage of the migrants residing in the open country and employed in non-agricultural occupations.

The percentage of the female migrants living in the open country varied from a maximum of 60 per cent for those that migrated prior to 1899 to a minimum of 47 per cent that migrated between 1919-1928. Like the percentage of the female migrants in agriculture, it showed a steady secular decline. Only those that started for themselves after 1908 left the open country more frequently than did their brothers.

**Schooling.**—Migrants whose schooling stopped at the eighth grade were found in the open country more often than any others. Of the migrants finishing 9 or more grades, 42 per cent of both males and females were living in the open country, as compared with 60 per cent of the males and 55 per cent of the females who had only 8 grades of schooling and 44 per cent of the males and 40 per cent of the females with less than eighth-grade schooling.

TABLE 23.—Migrants: Location by Schooling

Grade in school finished	Open country		Village		City		Total	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Male migrants								
0-7.....	24	44	6	12	24	44	54	100
8.....	276	60	49	11	134	29	459	100
9.....	113	42	29	11	128	47	270	100
Total*.....	413	53	84	11	286	36	783	100
Female migrants								
0-7.....	18	40	2	4	25	56	45	100
8.....	227	55	45	11	140	34	412	100
9.....	138	42	41	13	148	45	327	100
Total*.....	383	49	88	11	313	40	784	100

\*No data on 22 of the migrants.

The percentage of the male migrants located in villages did not vary significantly with amount of schooling; that for the females increased with additional schooling. Of those migrants living in the open country and having less than 8 grades of schooling, four out of five were farmers; of those possessing more than 8 grades of schooling one-half were farming. This phenomenon was partially due to the younger age of the migrants with some high school training and their recent date of migration. The number of people living in the open country and working at non-agricultural occupations had increased rapidly during the recent years concomitant with an increase in amount of schooling obtained. Analysis of the data according to the age of the migrants indicated that there was a greater tendency for non-farm migrants with more than eighth-grade than for those with less schooling to reside in the open country.

Thus, though additional schooling beyond the eighth grade appeared to reduce the chances that the migrant would enter the occupation of farming, it had less influence in determining his place of residence.

#### DISTANCE FROM PARENTAL HOME

The distance between the residence of the migrants and the parental home depended largely on the occupation in which the migrants were engaged, the type of community in which they were living, their age, and the section of the State in which they originated. Migrants from the Western Section were, in the majority of the cases, located nearer to the parental home than those from

the other sections. Comparing the sections on the basis of the percentage of the migrants located within a radius of 10 miles of the parental home we get the following figures: Western Section 59 per cent, Southeastern Section 45 per cent, and Northeastern Section 40 per cent. The percentage of the migrants in each section who were living at the parental home was, respectively, in the order above, 9, 10, and 26. This was equal to 13 per cent of all the migrants. A few of the migrants who were still living with their parents were farm laborers, but the majority of them, both male and female, were living at home and working in nearby villages or cities. This was particularly true in the Northeastern Section where opportunities for work in non-agricultural occupations were close at hand. The number of males who had started for themselves and were still living with their parents outnumbered the females 2 to 1.

TABLE 24.—Migrants: Location by Distance from Parental Home

Distance in miles less than:	Open country	Village	City
<i>Per cent</i>			
10.....	79	59	9
20.....	87	77	28
40.....	91	84	51
60.....	93	85	64
80.....	93	86	64
100.....	94	90	69
200.....	95	98	86
500.....	97	100	94
1000.....	99	.....	97
Total.....	100	100	100

**Residence in open country, village, or city.**—The distances from the parental home, at which the migrants were found, varied according to whether they lived in open country, village, or city, those in the open country living at the least, and those in cities at the greatest, distance. Part of this variation was due, of course, to the general tendency of migrants to locate at a comparatively short distance from the parental home (2 and 3, chs. 26). On the other hand, the distribution of villages and cities is such that migrants locating in the open country are likely to be, on the average, closer to the parental home than those who locate in villages; while those who locate in cities are likely to be found farthest from the parental home. This does not explain all of the variation seen in Table 24. While the migrants who located in open country and village were for the most part near the parental home or in the nearest village, those migrating to cities did not, in a majority of

the cases, locate in the nearest city. Thirty-one per cent of those living in cities were located more than 100 miles from the parental home as compared with but 2 per cent of those living in villages and 5 per cent of those living in the open country. As a rule the migrant who located near the parental home, located in the open country or a nearby village. Three-fourths of the migrants who were located more than 20 miles from the parental home were living in cities.

**Occupation.**—Since most of the migrants living in the open country were farming it may be inferred from the above discussion that most of the farmers were living near the parental home. Approximately two-thirds of the male and two-fifths of the female migrants who were in the occupation of farming were living within a radius of 2.5 miles of the parental home. Of those in non-agricultural occupations 23 per cent of the males and 18 per cent of the females were living within 2.5 miles.

TABLE 25.—Male Migrants: Distance from Parental Home by Occupation

Distance in miles less than:	Farmer				Non-farmer				
	Owner	Renter	Labor- er	Total	Labor- er	Busi- ness	Clerical and sales	Profes- sional	Total
<i>Per cent</i>									
2.5.....	59	70	67	65	25	29	14	19	23
10.....	77	79	72	77	33	44	17	19	31
20.....	84	89	82	86	51	54	36	30	45
40.....	89	93	83	90	67	59	49	35	61
60.....	92	94	90	92	78	63	56	42	70
80.....	92	94	90	92	79	66	59	44	72
100.....	93	95	92	94	81	68	61	49	75
200.....	96	98	93	96	92	83	71	63	86
500.....	97	100	97	98	97	93	92	88	95
1000.....	97	.....	100	99	98	98	97	95	98
Total.....	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

TABLE 26.—Female Migrants: Distance from Parental Home by Occupation

Distance in miles less than:	<i>Per cent</i>			
	Farm*	Non-farm		
		Total	Married	Single
2.5.....	42	18	17	23
10.....	58	27	26	29
20.....	76	45	45	46
40.....	89	63	62	64
60.....	90	74	73	78
80.....	91	76	75	81
100.....	92	78	76	84
200.....	96	90	90	90
500.....	99	95	95	96
1000.....	99	97	97	98
Total.....	100	100	100	100

\*All married.

Stated in terms of the percentage of the migrants at each distance in farm and non-farm occupations, the figures were:

	Farm	Non-farm	Total
Male migrants			
Less than 2.5 miles.....	62	38	100
2.5 to 9 miles.....	47	53	100
10 to 19 miles.....	23	77	100
20 or more miles.....	12	88	100
Female migrants			
Less than 2.5 miles.....	55	45	100
2.5 to 9 miles.....	51	49	100
10 to 19 miles.....	35	65	100
20 or more miles.....	20	80	100

It is evident from these tabulations that most of the migrants who entered the occupation of farming did so in a nearby location under conditions similar to those on the farm on which they were reared. Female migrants, on the average, located at a slightly greater distance from the parental home than male migrants in the same occupation.

#### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This study deals with the occupational and spatial changes of the adult children of 1275 families living in eight selected, open country areas of Ohio. It is based upon 1589 children who had begun life for themselves independent of the parental family.

Of the 1275 families represented, 93 per cent were farm families. Sixty-three per cent were owners, 20 per cent were renters, and 10 per cent farm laborers. Of the migrant children of these families, 91 per cent came from farm families; 75 per cent came from the families of farm owners.

The age of the adult children hereafter called migrants, ranged from 15 to 61 years. Approximately 75 per cent of the males were between the ages of 20 and 40 years; 78 per cent of the females were in this age group. The average age at which the males started for themselves was 21 years and for the females 20.1 years. The average age at which the males married was 23.2 years, and for the females 20.8 years.

The sexes were equal in number in the total migrant group, but there was some variation among the sections of the State.

At the time of starting for themselves, 41 per cent of the male migrants became farmers, 7 per cent as owners, 16 per cent as renters, and 18 per cent as farm laborers. Of the 59 per cent who

entered non-agricultural occupations, 45 per cent became laborers and 14 per cent entered the "white collar" occupations. Of those who began as farmers 80 per cent were still farming at the time of this study. Of those who began as owners 96 per cent were still farming; of those who began as renters 87 per cent were still farming; of those who began as farm laborers 67 per cent were still farming. Of those who began life for themselves in the non-agricultural occupations, only 6 per cent had returned to the farm.

Of every 100 owners at the time of this study, 54 had always been owners, 21 began as renters, 16 as farm laborers, 6 as non-agricultural laborers, and 3 began in the so-called "white collar" occupations. Of every 100 renters, 72 had always been renters, one began as an owner, 20 as farm laborers, 5 as non-agricultural laborers, and 2 began in the "white collar" occupations. Of every 100 farm laborers, 87 had always been farm laborers, while 13 began in the non-agricultural occupations.

At the time of this study 36 per cent of the male migrants were farming. In the Northwestern Section of the State, 43 per cent were farming; in the Northeastern, 20 per cent; and in the Southeastern Section 47 per cent were farming. Thus, the most urban section had the lowest percentage of the migrants farming, and the most rural section the highest percentage.

Factors which were clearly related to the proportion of the migrants that entered the occupation of farming were, for the males, occupation and tenure of parents, size of parental farm business, organization affiliations of parents, occupational and movement history of the parents, age of the migrants, and the economic condition of agriculture at the time the migrants started for themselves, age at starting for self, and schooling of the migrants. For females, the most significantly related factors were age and time at which they started for themselves, schooling, organization affiliation of parents, and number of younger brothers and sisters.

Since before 1900 the percentage of the female migrants marrying farmers has been declining. During the same period there has been an increase in the amount of schooling received by these female migrants.

As the number of children in the parental family increases there is an increasing disposition for the oldest of the girls to marry farmers. This suggests that those girls who marry farmers are more likely to be those who have more than average training in domestic work and in the rearing of children; i. e., they have served as apprentices in helping to rear their younger brothers and sisters.

As for the male migrants, it is evident that those who enter the occupation of farming are most likely to be the sons of the present farm owners who possess a farm business of more than average size. Approximately 60 per cent of migrants who entered farming as an occupation were sons of the 50 per cent of the farmers with the largest farm business.

Since the farmers who possess the large farm businesses are also farmers who have moved least, who have changed occupation least, who participate to a greater degree in community organization activities, and who have had more than average success as farmers, it follows that the majority of the boys who become farmers originate in the families of the most stable and successful farmers, where they have had more than average opportunity to learn the most successful techniques of agriculture.

As to schooling, the data indicate that those boys who enter farming are most likely to possess an eighth-grade education. Boys with less schooling are most likely to become non-agricultural laborers (5). About one-fifth of the high school graduates become farmers. Boys who begin high school but fail to graduate (38 per cent of those entering high school) enter farming less often than any other group except college graduates. It is suggested that this group is often composed of those who are neither interested in farming nor successful in school; most of them become non-agricultural laborers.

Considered from the standpoint of family origin, schooling, and the possession of technological training, as well as other factors, it would appear that agriculture is drawing a majority of its future farmers from those individuals who are most likely to be successful in the occupation.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Bean, L. H. 1929. Farm Income, Business Activity, and Population Movement. *The Agricultural Situation*. 13: No. 5, 20-23.
2. Lively, C. E. and Beck, P. G. 1930. Movement of Open Country Population in Ohio I. The Family Aspect. *Ohio Agr. Exp. Sta. Bull.* 467.
3. Sorokin, P. and Zimmerman, C. C. 1929. *Principles of Rural Urban Sociology*. Henry Holt and Company, New York.
4. Stephens, P. H. 1930. Farm Economics. *Cornell University Bull.* 64, 1271.
5. Truesdell, L. C. 1926. Farm Population of the United States, 1920. *Census Monograph VI*, Chap. V.
6. Wilcox, W. W. 1931. The Relationship of Certain Personal and Family Influences to Operator's Labor Earnings. *Division of Agricultural Economics, University of Minn. Mimeographed Report No. 42*, p. 8.
7. Young, E. C. 1923. The Movement of Farm Population. *Cornell Agr. Exp. Sta. Bull.* 42.
8. Zimmerman, C. C. and Smith, Lynn. 1928. Migration to Towns and Cities. *American Journal of Sociology*. 36: 49-51.
9. Zimmerman, C. C. and Corson, J. J. 1930, March. Migration to Towns and Cities. *Social Forces*.